

Criminal Miscellaneous No.8680 of 2015 (O & M)
Date of Decision: April 30, 2015

Harmeet Singh & another

..... PETITIONERS

VERSUS

State of Punjab

..... RESPONDENT(S)

. . .

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

. . .

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

. . .

PRESENT: - Dr. Amol Rattan Sidhu, Senior Advocate, with
Mr. Pratham Sethi, Advocate, for the
petitioners.

Mr. Jaspreet Singh Sekhon, Assistant Advocate
General, Punjab, assisted by Mr. A.K.
Khunger, Advocate, for the complainant.

. . .

Jaspal Singh, J

1. This petition has been preferred by Harmeet Singh
and Bhajan Singh under Section 439 Cr.P.C. seeking regular
bail in cross case DDR No.24 dated July 20, 2014 under
Sections 302 (added lateron), 307, 324, 323, 506, 148, 149 IPC

in FIR No.73 dated July 20, 2014 under Sections 324, 323, 506, 148, 149 IPC (Sections 326/307 IPC added lateron), registered at Police Station, Arniwala, District Fazilka.

2. At the very outset of arguments, learned counsel for the petitioners did not press the petition on behalf of petitioner No.1 – Harmeet Singh. Accordingly, petition qua petitioner No.1 – Harmeet Singh is dismissed as withdrawn being not pressed at this stage.

3. As far as petitioner No.2 – Bhajan Singh is concerned, petitioner inflicted a Kappa blow, from it sharp side, hitting on the left thumb of Jang Singh, complainant in cross case. Said injury falls within purview of Section 324 IPC. No injury is alleged to have been caused by petitioner No.2 – Bhajan Singh to deceased Ranga Singh. Petitioner also sustained injuries at the hands of complainant party. Moreover, it is a version and cross version case and it is yet to be established as to which of the parties was aggressive one, on the basis of evidence before the Trial Court.

4. Petitioner was arrested in this case on October 10, 2014 and since then, he is suffering incarceration. Challan has already been presented, disposal of which, is likely to take sufficient long time. Petitioner is no more required by the

investigating agency as investigation has already been completed.

5. Taking into consideration the above referred facts and without expressing on the merits of the case, this Court deems it a fit case to enlarge the petitioner on bail. Accordingly, petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate, Fazilka.

6. While parting with order, it is made explicit that anything observed in this order shall have no bearing on the merits of the main case and observation, if any, shall remain limited to the disposal of this petition.

April 30, 2015

avin

(Jaspal Singh)
Judge